DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 571 SP 014 119

AUTHOR Van Patten, James J.
TITLE Human Values and Educational Goals: Addressing the Cult of Efficiency.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Community Attitudes; *Decision Making; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Humanistic Education; Noninstructional Responsibility; Organizational Climate; Professional Personnel; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Modern educational philosophy too often considers product-oriented efficiency the highest priority of the educational system, to the great detriment of the actual learning process. This situation could be altered by a shift in public and administrative attitudes towards the professional teacher. A more sympathetic approach to the problems of teaching and more realistic expectations regarding the teacher's influence on children in the wider social context are called for. Teachers should have more of a voice in the decisionmaking process. They should be given greater latitude in developing personal classroom techniques and should not be pressured into adopting either an innovative or a traditional style. Teachers must stop being the scapegoat for all of society's evils, as education must stop being the universal panacea. A more profound understanding of the teacher's role and responsibility will ultimately lead to a more profound understanding of education itself. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED174571

11 23 AM '79

"HUMAN VALUES AND EDUCATIONAL GOALS: ADDRESSING THE CULT OF EFFICIENCY"

James J. Van Patten
University of Arkansas

Francis Bacon defined idols of the marketplace as words which force and overrule understanding, throw all into confusion, and lead men away into numberless empty controversies and idle fancies. [1] This is the state of affairs educators find themselves in today. From authoritarianism in Colonial Education through the business Cult of Efficiency in the 1920s to Progressive Education in the 1950s and 1960s and rethreading all of these elements into education in the late 1970s, we are facing the dilemma of Bacon's idols. Lewis Carroll illustrated the challenge well:

> Alice never could quite make out, in thinking it over afterwards, how it was that they began; all she remembers is that they were running hand in hand, and the queen went so fast that it was all she could do to keep up with her; and still the Queen kept crying "faster! Faster!!" but Alice felt she could not go faster, though she had no breath left to say so. The most curious part of the thing was that the trees and the other things round them never changed their places at all; however fast they went, they never seemed to pass anything. "I wonder if all the things move along with us?" thought poor puzzled Alice. And the Queen seemed to guess her thoughts, for she cried, "Faster! Faster!" and dragged her along. "Are we nearly there?" Alice managed to pant out at last. "Nearly there!" the Queen repeated. "Why, we passed it ten minutes ago! Faster!" And they ran on for a time in silence, with the wind whistling in Alice's ears and almost blowing her hair off her head, she fancied. "Now! Now!" cried the Queen. "Faster! Faster!" And they went so fast that at last they seemed to skim through the air, hardly touching the ground with their feet, till suddenly, just as Alice was getting quite exhausted, they stopped, and she found herself sitting on the ground, breathless and giddy. The Queen propped her up against a tree, and said kindly, "You may rest a little now." Alice looked around her

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James J. Van Patten
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

SP014 119

in great surprise. "Why, I do believe we've been under this tree the whole time. Everything is just as it was." "Of course it is," said the Queen, "what would you have it?" "Well, in our country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing." "A slow sort of country!" said the Queen. "Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!" [2]

Educators tread the same ground again and again sometimes pouring new wine into old bottles, reinventing the wheel, discovering and utilizing outmoded and discarded concepts from other fields such as business. Frequently, they find an idea which, although inapplicable to education, they apply wholesale as a universal panecea. Measurement, management by objectives, performance contracting and accountability suggest quick technological fixes to complex questions. The problem is that the quick cheap technological fixes create more problems often unforseen than they solve.

Back to Basics or Forward to Understanding

Current back to basics rhetoric ignores the roles of education in society. Basics are needed; but more than basics, we need the ability to think, to ask why, and to deal with abstractions and concepts. A neatly packaged technological fix from kindergarten through graduate school is found in learning packets, multi-media kits, mastery learning, and microteaching. The multiplier effect of such techniques may be that students feel that learning is easy, that they don't have to work. Push a button-you have an answer. Pick up a phone and dial for information. Memorize the basics in drill and you can feed back required information on a standardized test. In the world of work, however, such technological gimeckry no longer works. Individuals are required to think for themselves, work often without supervision, write new and original reports.

Thus, our real need in education is to move forward to understanding concepts, ideals, theories and relationships. Advocates of Back-to-Basics perpetuate a cruel hoax on a public that deserves the best education a society can give. Perceptive parents have long been aware of educators' confusion as they seek to be all things to all people. These parents have, when financially able, placed their children in schools designed to encourage and enhance independent, rigorous, and critical thinking.

Why the Faith in Technology and Science? [3]

Educators' limitless faith in packaged technical responses to educational issues has a long lineage of historical precedence. From Descartes and Newton, faith in science has grown until technology reignes supreme. The first issue of magazines Daedulus, founded twenty years ago, eulogized the arena of science proclaiming science as progress. This inseparable relationship has become deeply imbedded in educational thought and practice. Thus, education strives to ape the world of precision found in the sciences.

Administrators are invoking new deities of competency-based instruction, behavioral objectives, management by results, thereby limiting teachers' freedom to teach, grow, and learn. Schools at all levels are endangered through over-emphasis on measurement as illustrated by John Dewey in Individualism - Old and New:

> Our emotional life is quick, excitable, undiscriminating, lacking in individuality and in direction by intellectual life. Hence, the externality and superficiality of the American soul; it has no ultimate inner unity and uniqueness - no true personality.
>
> The marks and signs of this 'impersonalization' of the human soul are quantification of life, with its attendant

> disregard of quality; its mechanization and the almost universal habit of esteeming technique as an end, not as a means, so that organic and intellectual life is also 'rationalized' and finally standardization. [4]

Teachers find themselves beset on every side. Students undisciplined, unmotivated, unconcerned are more numerous than those who have the will to learn. Too many parents support, far too frequently, students in their desire for maximum freedom and minimum responsibility. Administrators restrict teachers to a minor role in decision-making processes. Administrators are often willing to support a bag-of-tricks concept in instruction that meets the immediate need; and in the face of social protest they support action regardless of its quality and without concern for the ends and means of education.

The result is that public schools are accused of anti-intellectualism and of offering cafeteria-style curricula, superficial and discontinuous, requiring neither concentration nor precision. Teachers are blamed for being popularity seekers instead of representing legitimate authority. [5] There emerges an environment which is not conducive to the intellectual, professional growth of teachers, learners, or administrators.

In Sartor Resartus, Thomas Carlyle viewed teachers as fashioners of souls who out to be world honored as much as field generals and field marshals. [6] What and how realistic are the expectations educational critics have of their schools and teachers expectations that lead to continuing questionning of the performance of teachers? What are the implications for the critics of the enlarging of language to eliminate dichotomies in viewing teaching? How can we honor teachers as suggested by Carlyle?

Framework of the Critics

Whatever the individual or group may be that attacks teachers for dismal performance, it is necessary to explore the basis on which they make their judgements. In general, critics of teachers look to specific measurements of pupil performance rather than to causal limitations and the teacher environment. Thus, critics look at product and place the product within an efficiency frame of reference.

The posture is oversimplification. Critics' presuppositions include (1) looking to the school as a universal panacea for solving social and individual problems, (2) viewing the teacher as an autonomous individual free to make decisions affecting all avenues of the teaching-learning process, (3) looking for fixed ends of teaching, (4) compartmentalizing the teacher role, (5) failing to understand the implications of free, universal, compulsory education.

First, schools are asked to solve problems that society and its members either cannot or will not resolve. From integration to driver education, schools have been asked to take on difficult and in some instances impossible tasks. That they have always tried to respond is clear and that success has been problematical in specific results is also evident.

Second, teachers are far from autonomous even in areas of their competence. Lack of democratic administration and a desire to share in the decision-making process are concerns of teachers at all levels. There is a long history of excluding teachers from decision making. In 1910, Frederick W. Taylor wrote of "scientific management" to create efficiency in industry. Franklin Bobbitt, an instructor in educational aministration at the University of Chicago, writing The Supervision of

City Schools for the Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, published in 1913, brought Taylor's concept to education. [7] Bobbitt wrote "the burden of finding the best methods is too large and too complicated to be laid on the shoulders of teachers." [8] All measurement of product or student performance was to be made by supervisors to increase efficiency of teaching. [9] This same efficiency movement whether measurement by objectives or results is with us today.

Third, when the critics refer to product, they are dealing with fixed ends of education. Dewey suggested that such fixed positions "illustrate the subjection of present activity to remote ends." [10] Teachers are viewed as robots instead of creatures of creative intelligence. This concept negates the progress of teachers and their role in society fought so hard by Mann in his 9th annual report.

> Essential requisites in a teacher's character are, a love of children, and a love of his work. He must not be a hireling. . . . The school teacher is not, as it sometimes seems to be supposed, placed upon a perpetually revolving wheel, and carried through a daily round of the same labors and duties. . . . The teacher can neither transfuse knowledge by any process of decanting, nor inject it by any force, into the mind of a child; but the law of the relation subsisting between them is, that he must have the child's conscious assent and concurrence, before he can impart it. He cannot impart, unless the child consents to receive. [11]

Fourth, critics frequently compartmentalize the teacher's role by looking at a narrow view of their activities. If the stress is on narrow limits of teacher action, i.e. producing high test scores for students by training for the test, there is a danger of stressing only that which can be measured. Etzioni writes:

> Most organizations under pressure to be rational are eager to measure their efficiency. Curiously, the very effort - the desire to establish how we are doing and to find ways of improving if we are not doing as

> well as we ought to do--often has quite undesired effects from the point of view of organizational goals. Frequent measuring can distort the organizational efforts because, as a rule, some aspects of output are more measurable than others. Frequent measuring tends to encourage over-production of highly measurable items and neglect of less measurable ones. . . . High schools which measure the quality of their curricula by the number of students who pass the Regents Examination find that some teachers neglect the character-development of their students to drill them for tests. [12]

As John Dewey noted, production apart from fulfillment becomes purely a matter of quantity. . . . and the situation exemplifies the concrete meaning of the separation of means and ends which is the intellectual reflex of the divorce of theory and practice, intelligence and habit, foresight and present impulse. [13]

Finally, the fifth oversimplification of the critics is failing to understand implications of free, universal, compulsory education. The common school is for all students regardless of social or intellectual background. The secondary school as well as the community college operate in general under open admissions. Whether this will change due to increased costs in the future remains to be seen. In the nineteenth century students were required to repeat courses and classes they failed resulting in a bunching up of students at the seventh and eighth grades. At the turn of the century in 1908, David Snedden and William H. Allen wrote, "School Reports and School Efficiency" stressing business efficiency methods in education. They advocated automatically promoting students, thereby ensuring against economic waste of failure equivalent to scrap in a factory. Until there is a global attack on misunderstanding of the implications of free, universal education and its role in a free society, teachers will continue to

bear unjust criticism. The open school provides a route to cognitive and affective domain development. It is not conceivable that taking the child from where he is to as far as his talents and abilities can carry him can be achieved without assistance from the other social institutions, particularly the family. Under a two-ladder system, there is opportunity to function with the intellectual elite and with the common person, but such is not the case in a democratic society. Overexpectation of the school in such a society is unwarranted. As one institution, it can provide the tools for disciplined inquiry and intellectual growth. The larger questions of finding a satisfactory social role for the pupil on completion of the school program entails asking Count's question, "Dare The School Build a New Social Order?"

Too often critics have been guilty of presuppositions tending toward oversimplication. Schools are asked to solve problems that often cannot be resolved without all elements of society supporting their efforts. Teachers become the victims of excessive expectations. Teachers are not autonomous and frequently are not involved in decision making even in their areas of competence. In addition lay boards of education decrease possibility of professionalism in educational decision making.

Critics have too often stressed fixed ends, not possibility of growth. As Dewey noted in Science of Education:

> Moreover, even it it be true that everything which exists could be measured - if only we knew how - that which does not exist cannot be measured. And it is no paradox to say that the teacher is deeply concerned with what does not exist. For a progressive school is primarily concerned with growth, with a moving and changing process, with transforming existing capacities and experiences; what already exists by way of native endowment and past

> achievement is subordinate to what it may become. Possibilities are more important than what already exists, and knowledge of the latter counts only in its bearing upon possibilities. [14]

Eliminating Dichotomies in Viewing Teacher Roles

In addition to oversimplification in judging teacher performance, critics have tended to dichotomize the language of teacher behavior and education.

(1) Individuals form schools and schools are formed by individuals. Schools do not exist apart from but are part of society. Teachers serve as members of society and members of the school staff. Thus, they represent both the school and society. As society honors its lawyers and doctors by respecting their judgments, so should society learn to honor its teachers by encouraging their professional growth through heeding teacher and educator advice. This is not to say we should return to Plato's concept of one ship - one navigator but that a multitude of uninformed opinions are of less worth than trained professionals - i.e. teachers in reference to educational matters.

(2) Teaching is not only a product that is conveyed to students; it is also a process or activity designed to transform pupil behavior through providing assistance and help in disciplined inquiry. Thus, teaching is a process or activity and is also a product conveyed to the pupil. They are not separate but complementary factors.

(3) Discipline is a process affecting the student as when teachers expect and encourage inquiry; and discipline is a product a student gains by acquiring learning. Thus, discipline is both a process and product.

(4) Teachers may start with a program, then work with the student; or they may start with the student and develop the program on the basis of individual differences. The two are complementary. From program to student or student to program the focus is on providing common learnings designed to meet individual needs.

(5) Teachers cannot legitimately separate ends and means. Ends and means are complementaries. When we expect to train students for a democratic society, we espouse democratic means in teacher methods to attain the responsive, responsible mature decision maker than is needed in society.

The elimination of dichotomies gives the larger world view to teaching and contributes to the potential breakthrough of finding a commonplace or common ground to understand rather than to criticize or praise the endeavors of our educators. Much criticism of teachers would be eliminated through a holistic approach to education as the process of inquiry, growth, and discovery in life itself. Such an approach would place the work of teachers, teaching, and education in proper perspective and allow for the liberating influence of creative intelligence. If critics see themselves as educators in the larger meaning of the word, then their efforts are needed to support the work of the schools. They are part of both the process and product of education as well as the ends and means. Thus, it is the quality of the process of communicating the need for eliminating dichotomies in viewing teachers that is needed.

How Can We Honor Rather Than Dishonor Teachers

Learning is both the process of acquiring knowledge of self and the world and the product of acquired knowledge or skill. There should be interdependence in process and product; ends and means; student and program. We can begin to develop a new categorical imperative - to honor teachers in their critical role of providing a bridge between acquiring and acquired knowledge. In recognizing this role, it is imperative to rethink the role and function of teaching.

(1) All individuals should be treated as ends worthy of consideration in their own right. No teacher should be treated as means for others, advancement whether through assigning overly heavy workloads or ignoring their personal strengths.

(2) Teachers should be involved in the decision-making process whenever and wherever possible as professionals whose judgment is to be honored.

(3) There should be more collegial and less hierarchial relationships.

(4) Attention should be given to balancing innovative, experimental programs with regular, traditional, existing ones. Teachers should be given opportunities to participate in both according to interest and be protected in their traditional areas of teaching from encroachment by the innovative areas.

(5) Professionals require administrative support, public understanding, and time for professional growth. Therefore, in honoring teachers, administrators have an obligation to enhance communication with all involved to better explain and interpret the complexities of teaching roles.

(6) Teachers should not be made the scapegoats for the faults of home, family, or society. The limitations of potential for modifying behavior of yourth should be understood in view of the relatively small amount of time teachers spend with students.

It is well worth reviewing the work of Mann and Dewey both of whom dedicated their lives to enhancing the professionalization of teachers. A democracy requires a school environment to provide teachers with a constant capacity for adaptation to the social changes and environmental modifications that allow the fullest possible utilization of our precious human resources. Dewey illustrated the larger world view of teaching:

> Yet every act may carry within itself a consoling and supporting consciousness of the whole to which it belongs and which in some sense belongs to it. With responsibility for intelligent determination of particular acts may go a joyful emancipation from the burden for responsibility for the whole which sustains them, giving them their final outcome and quality. [15]

Horace Mann illustrated the role of the school in society, stressing the broader role of education.

> Without undervaluing any other human agency, it may be safely affirmed that the Common School, improved and energized, as it can easlily be, may become the most effective and benign of all the forces of civilization.

> Two reasons sustain this position. In the first place, there is a universality in its operation, which can be affirmed of no other institution whatever. If administered in the spirit of justice and conciliation, all the rising generation may be brought within the circle of its reformatory and elevating influences. And, in the second place, the materials upon which it operates are so pliant and ductile as to be susceptible of assuming a greater variety of forms than any other earthly work. . . [16]

When the dichotomy between teacher and student is eliminated, the quality of the process of the relationship can be enhanced, and both process and product of education advance. Focusing too narrowly on educational product leads critics to oversimplification in their view of teacher's roles. Excessive concern with measurement ignores potential and possibility for human growth. It behooves us to honor teachers and teaching. As Carlyle suggested, it is easy to honor them when we remember the task they have undertaken and the commitment they make to the infinite possibility and potential for the improvement of humankind. Not only is Plato's mandate of 2,000 years ago applicable but it should provide our direction--Education Is Man's Best Hope For The Future. Replacing outmoded Idols of The Marketplace for a new categorical imperative "to honor people," is a base for a new dawn in education.

FOOTNOTES

1. Francis Bacon, "The Advancement of Learning," sr. ed. Pagobert D. Runes, Treasury of World Philosophy, Paterson: New Jersey: Littlefield Adams Co., 1959, p. 107-108.

2. Lewis Carroll, Through The Looking Glass, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977, pp. 40-44.

3. Mendelsohn, Seminar Science & Society, Harvard University, Kirkland House, July 21-28, 1978.

4. John Dewey, Individualism-Old and New, New York: Capricorn Books, 1929 pp. 23-24.

5. Alma S. Whittlin, "The Teacher," in the Professions in America, edited by Kenneth S. Lynn, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, p. 93.

6. Ibid., p. 92.

7. Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 19,79.

8. Frankiln Bobbitt, "The Supervision of City Schools," Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Bloomington, Illinois: NSSE, 1913, pp. 51-52.

9. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, p. 87.

10. John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, New York: Modern Library, 1922, p. 271.

11. Horace Mann, Ninth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education, December 10, 1845, Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, pp. 83-85.

12. Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 9-10.

13. Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, pp. 272,275.

14. John Dewey, "Progressive Education and the Science of Education," in Martin S. Dworkin, Editor, Dewey on Education, New York: Teachers College, 1959, p. 118.

15. John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 331.

16. Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education, West Newton Massachusetts, November 24, 1848, Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1849, pp. 42-45.